

Administrative Determination (AD)
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management
Anchorage Field Office

A. BLM Office: Anchorage Field Office **Lease/Serial Case File No.:** AA-77018

Proposed Action Title/Type: Special Recreation Permits (commercial hunting)

Location of Proposed Action: The Proposed Action affects the BLM-administered lands within Guide Use Area (GUA) 16-01 and 16-02 near Chakachamna Lake and more specifically:

Seward Meridian, T. 12 N., R. 16 W., All;
T. 10 N., R. 17 W., All; T. 11 N., R. 17 W., All; T. 12 N., R. 17 W., All;
T. 5 N., R. 18 W., Secs. 4 to 9, inclusive, Secs. 16 to 21 inclusive, and
Secs. 28-33, inclusive; T. 10 N., R. 18 W., All; T. 11 N., R. 18 W., All;
T. 12 N., R. 18 W., All; T. 10 N., R. 19 W., All; T. 11 N., R. 19 W., All;
T. 12 N., R. 19 W., All; T. 14 N., R. 19 W., All; T. 15 N., R. 19 W., All;
T. 16 N., R. 19 W., All; T. 10 N., R. 20 W., All; T. 11 N., R. 20 W., All;
T. 12 N., R. 20 W., All; T. 14 N., R. 20 W., All; T. 15 N., R. 20 W., All;
T. 16 N., R. 20 W., All.

Description of the Proposed Action

Mr. Haeg has applied for a Special Recreation Permit (SRP) to conduct guided brown/grizzly and black bear on BLM administered land from April 1st to October 31st in GUA 16-01 and 16-02. The season to hunt each species may vary depending on the hunting regulations established by Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) but is typically August 10th through May 25th for brown/grizzly bear and no closed season for black bear.

The land associated with GUA 16-01 and 16-02 and the proposed guiding locations will be in the vicinity of Chakachamna Lake, Chilligan and McArthur Rivers, and Blacksand Creek. A number of camp locations have been requested; only two are located on BLM managed land. Of the two locations requested, one has an existing outfitter operating there (McArthur River). Authorization for a camp on Blacksand Creek is requested. A typical guided hunt would last 10 days and include a 1:1 or 1:2 guide to client ratio totaling 20 to 30 user days per trip. Mr. Haeg will likely have no more than four hunters at a time and generally have eight or fewer hunters each year.

Applicant (if any): David Haeg, The Bush Pilot Inc.

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP Name: *Southcentral Management Framework Plan*

Date Approved: March 1980

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the applicable LUP, specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions: Activity objectives Recreation (R-3) and Wildlife (WL-4) and Minerals (M-2). These decisions do not directly address special use permitting, but recognize that hunting, fishing, and trapping are legitimate uses of public land.

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action.

AK-040-02-EA-033: *Environmental Assessment: Special Recreation Permit for guided big game hunts*. This document is on file in the Anchorage Field Office.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the current Proposed Action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current Proposed Action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?**

The Proposed Action analyzed in AK-040-02-EA-033 is the same Proposed Action for the same applicants. Thus the use locations, access, duration, and time of year have not changed.

- 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current Proposed Action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Yes. Additional alternatives beyond the No Action Alternative were not viewed as necessary at the time of the analysis.

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?**

No new information has been presented that would change the Decision Record.

- 4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current Proposed Action?**

Yes. The approach used in the previous document is appropriate. The analysis in this document is similar to what would be appropriate for the Proposed Action.

- 5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA**

document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current Proposed Action?

Yes. No additional direct or indirect impacts have been identified. Site specific impacts were analyzed in AK-040-02-EA-033.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Yes. No cumulative impacts are expected with the continuation of the current Proposed Action.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current Proposed Action?

Yes. State land managers have been made aware of the current Proposed Action and have submitted their concurrence.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:

Dave Doucet, Lead Preparer

Also, see the attached NEPA routing form.

F. Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are required beyond those developed for AK-040-02-EA-033.

G. Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the Proposed Action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

/s/ Clinton E. Hanson, Acting
Anchorage Field Manager

April 22, 2003
Date